

**BUTTE COUNTY
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES COMMISSION
Friday, August 23, 2002
Minutes**

Held at the Gridley City Council Chambers, the meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

Item 1: Introductions & Agenda Review

Commissioners present: Chair Patricia Cragar, Jane Dolan, Marian Gage, Mark Lundberg, Sandra Machida, Karen Marlatt, Linda Moore, and Gene Smith.

Commissioners absent: Gary House.

Staff present: Cheryl Giscombe, and Eva Puciata.

Staff absent: None.

No changes were made to the agenda.

Item 2: Approval of Draft June 21, 2002 Minutes

Marian Gage moved to approve the minutes as written. Gene Smith seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 3: Staff Report

Cheryl Giscombe reported media coverage occurred for the large grants, and our current media rep, Stephen Phippen, planned Project REWARDS coverage. We are uncertain whether REWARDS coverage occurred yet, as he's on vacation now.

Gary, Eva, and Cheryl attended a Financial Planning Workshop in Sacramento in June, the workshops have continued via net conferencing. Eva participated in one of those, another will occur soon. Bobbi Riley will today present our baseline plan. Our tentative timeline for financial planning is very ambitious. We may need to change it, as a lot is on our plate, i.e., our Strategic Plan Revision is due in Nov.

Regarding feedback on our funding priorities developed with Steve Kaplan's help, we have not been able to present to the Child Abuse Council yet. Cheryl is scheduled to present on Tuesday, September 10, 2002.

An eligibility list for the position vacated by Gina Ellena was requested. Gina and Cheryl interviewed six candidates, and Eva Puciata was selected and has accepted the position. During the Administration Committee report, adding another Administrative Analyst position to staff will be discussed. The Admin. Services position will be eliminated until we see how the new tobacco tax will affect revenues, with all staff taking on some of the secretarial duties until then.

Statewide Evaluation meetings are occurring. A very large survey response is due from us in mid-September. Staff will gather input from Commissioners via email to expedite the process.

Gina Ellena, before taking her new position, provided additional mini-grant reports. Three analyses should prove very useful: 1) A staff analysis of mini-grants will help in guiding any future mini-grant processes. 2) Pros and cons of having a mini-grant process was in the June Staff Report. 3) A report in this month's packet explains capital investments over \$5K are no longer allowed with State monies.

Patricia voiced appreciation of Gina Ellena's dedication and work.

Marian said mini-grants were supposed to last a year, but there is over a \$300K remaining balance. She voiced concern that few mini-grants got scores of 100%. Many seem to be lagging behind. She would

like some more in-depth reports to see if concern is warranted. Are there legitimate reasons for the delays? Do mini-grants really work?

Linda said that maybe some grantees jumped in on the grant process to get the money, without thinking about ramifications.

Gene said he shared Marian's concern. **It might be helpful to separate benchmarks from reporting requirements in scoring.** Doing this might tell what TA is needed, and tell what results we're getting for our money.

Patricia said to agendize Mini-Grant review for a future meeting. When an additional analyst is hired, we'll be able to get more information. Our human resources are spread thin.

Marian asked whether large grants are required to do quarterly billing. How do they get paid? Mini-grantees had the option of doing quarterly billings, or periodic reimbursement based on services. The large grant billings are similar. Marian said inconsistent contractor billings make it harder on staff.

Jane Dolan pointed out that Gina's mini-grant analysis states that one reason grantees got low scores, is because they are too busy providing direct services to children to fill out paperwork. Sometimes late filing of reports means the work is being done.

Cheryl referred to the Scope of Work for Barbara Riley, presenting later today. TASC is funding her presentation. **Gene asked how much more TASC monies are available to the Commission.** (We are currently utilizing Stephen Kaplan and Barbara Riley from TASC for TA.)

Linda commented she saw Jeanie Sharkley, Valley Oaks Children's Services, on Channel 12 News, but there was no mention of Commission funding!

Gene said next April's State Commission conference will be in Garden Grove, Anaheim, and he is interested in going.

Cheryl said that a Safe From the Start conference would be held in Oroville at the Gold County Casino, on October 9, 2002 from 6 to 8p.m. It is put on by the State Attorney General's office, with Feather River Tribal Health as the local sponsor.

Cheryl said Gary, Eva, and she attended the CCAFA Staff Summit in South Lake Tahoe last week. Some of the topics covered were: "Managing Up" (working with Commissioners, Stakeholders, issues and challenges; attended by Cheryl), "Managing Out" (for challenges working with ED's, staff, and other funded agencies; attended by Eva). On the second day there was a thorough state of the State budget and its impact on local commissions presentation by the new CCAFA director, who spoke at length on how the new tax will affect revenues. Gary took copious notes, when he's here he may report on it. Arthur Himmelman, an internationally recognized collaboration expert, presented a moving presentation on partnerships and how to use collaboration to create systems change. California Head Start's Jean Monroe presented the last workshop, "Incorporating Equity Principles into our Daily Work." Both Himmelman and Monroe spoke a great deal about inclusion in governance and how to go about doing that. Monroe said parents are 51% of the decision-making body in Head Start. Youth and clients (parents) of Prop 10 sit on some commissions! Cheryl said this was the best association conference she has attended.

Cheryl said the *Building Blocks* newsletter should be in Commissioner's mail. Lots of School Readiness information is in the current issue.

Cheryl said one of her roles and responsibilities as Program Manager to the Commission is to stay abreast of State and local issues that may have impact on us. A recent local legislation that seems to present much affect on the Commission is the Butte County Community Health Care Ordinance passed by the BOS in July. In presenting the issue today, she intends to stay out of pros and cons of the Ordinance, and out of any political implications. She passed out copies of the Ordinance as faxed from Butte County Admin.

Cheryl gave some background history to the ordinance: The intent of the ordinance is to ensure that the Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) has spending accountability. Local health care providers have circulated a counter measure, a Citizen's Initiative (Measure G) to insure the MSA monies are spent on health programs. Another commission will be developed and designed very similar to our Commission and will be making recommendations to us for future funding. This may implicate our present financial planning.

Cheryl presented facts in a PowerPoint presentation: The County ordinance stipulates "coordination" among tobacco related funds: Prop 10, Prop 99, and the MSA monies. If Measure G passes in November, the new Commission will not be advisory to us, and our funding allocation will drive dispersal of funds. In either

case, the BCCFC may have to consider its commitment to tobacco prevention programs. Current Preliminary priority areas do not list tobacco prevention as a funding priority. The issues coming up are, how do we integrate services, and how do we insure accountability? Our Commission has some of the same goals.

Some of the language in the Supervisor's ordinance is incorrect. It states State Commission funding guidelines instead of County CFC guidelines, i.e. the mandate for mass media campaigns. County Prop 10 funds have a wider scope of services than tobacco prevention.

Cheryl said sometimes it's easy to function in a vacuum without taking into consideration local and state legislative changes. Dialogue is important with the stakeholders. It'll be necessary to be attentive to the changes. The recommendation was to ask the County CAO give a presentation to this Commission to start the dialogue process.

Gene said the role of the new County Commission is not outlined specifically, except that they will be advisory to us.

Marian suggested we send a letter to the BOS asking for clarification. How will we interrelate? It seems that the ordinance implies a relationship, in terms of reporting to the community about how tobacco funds are being spent. We don't want to duplicate efforts. The Ordinance, in section three, talks about an educational campaign, and a healthcare delivery system. (The County is currently funding BCOE and the Lung Association for cessation.) Not aware they are doing items C & D. The ordinance does not clearly state expectations that they would want some Prop 10 funds, and it's not clear who will supply staff support. Nor are the dialogue process, nor roles and responsibilities clear.

Marian said the only links between the two Commissions are Gary House and maybe Jane Dolan (two Supervisors will sit on the new commission). Will that be a conflict of interest on certain issues?

Jane said the Ordinance has been adopted. The BOS decided to pass the Ordinance rather than place it before the voters, because if it were placed before the voters, it requires another vote to change even a sentence in it.

Marian said Measure G will be on the November ballot. Measure G was initiated by the American Cancer Society and the Medical Association, talks about a whole different way to use the MSA monies. If voters passed Measure G the BOS Ordinance will be null and void, according to the Tobacco Coalition.

Patricia said it sounds like we've got a little information, and we should invite the CAO's office to give us a presentation on Sept. 20. She asked whether there was a distinct timeline for the Commissions to begin interacting.

Jane said the BOS thought was to create open dialogue between the Tobacco revenues, better coordination and delivery of services. We should write a letter to BOS ask for further clarification how best to cooperate with the ordinance, and request a presentation.

Marian Gage made a motion to request a presentation from the CAO's office regarding the Ordinance to clarify its meaning and answer questions. Linda Moore seconded. Mark said the issue could take the entire meeting, and we have set aside time to finish our financial plan and funding priorities, so the presentation should be time limited.

The motion passed unanimously.

Patricia suggested a letter and phone call go to the CAO, requesting a presentation with parameters of time.

Item 4: Administration Commissioner Committee Report

Patricia Cragar reported the Admin. Committee's recommendation is to change Bylaw language and increase the membership of the Commission by two members because making a quorum was a challenge.

Mark asked about the wording, "absence of four or five." Cheryl explained that both alternates would be able to vote if five regular members were present.

Marian requested that it be on record that Commissioner alternatives be given priority for Commission vacancy appointment. The alternates would be commissioners in training. **There was discussion and Marian agreed to move this issue to the Admin. Committee.**

There was more discussion: some counties have alternates that only vote on certain categories. Was lowering the quorum requirement to five considered? Current appointment policies state that geographical and interest areas are considered in who is appointed. Mark talked about writing a letter to the BOS to appoint two alternatives. Do we have to change the ordinance? It's an appointment procedure.

Marian Gage made a motion to approve the Admin. Committee's recommendation to add two alternate commissioners. Karen Marlatt seconded.

It was agreed to have recruitment, as was done for the recent vacancy, and then make a recommendations for the two alternates to the BOS. We will inform the BOS that recruitment is occurring, followed by recommendations for two new alternate Commissioners.

The Admin. Committee recommends that the rotation of meetings stop, as rotating has not brought in more public, but has added to the workload of staff. The regular Commission meetings will be held at 202 Mira Loma Drive, in the building host to Commission offices. If community engagement meetings are held, we can rotate them between the four cities again.

Gene Smith made a motion that future Commission meetings be held at the Commission offices in Oroville. Mark Lundberg seconded.

Jane Dolan said if we want community involvement we need to have evening meetings occasionally. Gene said that Bylaws say we will meet quarterly, rotating between the four cities. Bylaws will be amended to reflect regular meetings in Oroville, with additional community meeting times and dates.

The motion passed unanimously.

Cheryl said the Admin. Committee approved her recommendation to add another Admin. Analyst position. The two Admin. Analyst's will have distinct duties, but will work together. Eva will handle claims and contracting, and the new position will do outreach and community capacity-building. We are eliminating the Admin. Services Asst. position until we see what happens to revenues after the new tobacco tax. Enough monies are in the current budget to have four staff members.

Linda Moore moved to approve adding a second Analyst. Gene Smith seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 5: School Readiness Commissioner Committee Report

Marian Gage reported that our School Readiness application was not approved, and a conference call with the State was held to receive clarification. Rather than revise the first application, they will start from scratch and write a new application to be submitted for the December 15, 2002 deadline. An individual application for each school site may be done.

Linda said the State liked most of the application, but denied it because it focused on planning, and did not talk about implementation and services.

Heather Senske reported Cindy Young has replaced Sandy Emerick as BCOE's School Readiness Coordinator. (Heather said she would do the evaluation for REWARDS. **Marian asked for an update on REWARDS in an upcoming meeting.**)

There was discussion that half of the SR applications were denied. County Commission staff and statewide stakeholders were readers for the SR applications. Some TA was provided, but a request for feedback from reviewers has not yet occurred.

Item 6: Children's Services Coordinating Council Presentation, Status Update & Next Steps for I&R Project

Cathi Grams, Chair of the Children's Services Coordinating Council, reported the I&R management team has been meeting every two weeks. Amos Clifford was hired as Project Coordinator. A data specialist will start working next week.

They looked for existing user-friendly software, and will go with a product called Refer 2000. Information from Passages will be downloaded into it, and services for children and families added.

Policies (such as inclusion/exclusion) are being developed, and are evolving. A data sheet for the data specialist's interviews has been developed. A work plan is being developed, and they are coming up with a marketing plan and a website name. Although the future of the statewide 211 system is uncertain, planning is done with it in mind. The website should be operational in December of this year.

Cathi asked to be agendized again in a few months, to present the Project Coordinator and budgets for years two and three. (TANF incentive funds are not a continuing source of funds.) By the end of the FY, she hopes to present long-term goals and budgets, and actual demonstration of the product.

Marian asked that the next presentation include info re: whether the website will be membership based, how the referral portion will work, and how updates will occur. Mark asked about HIPPA (privacy) implications. The website will be similar to a phone book, and not contain privacy-related info.

Item 7: Mini-Grantee Presentations

Anna Dove, Butte County Health Education Supervisor, and Brandy Waddell, Health Educator, presented for the Butte County ETS mini-grant. Grant implementation was in January 02. The purpose of the grant was to reduce second-hand exposure in the homes of WIC clients by providing education, and to increase referral to cessation (American Lung Assoc., California Healthline). Brandy took the facilitator training from American Lung so she could do one-on-one cessation trainings. Services are provided at the WIC offices in both Chico and Oroville. Due to cost-savings, services will be provided through Dec. WIC clients are becoming more comfortable with Brandy and accepting of her input.

Brandy passed out graphs and explained them. They have far exceeded project benchmarks. They were expected to provide services to 450 WIC clients, but reached 977. 141 people were referred to cessation. Out of those, 10 people were expected to quit. 11 have. Barriers have mostly been language, i.e. Hmong speaking people often do not read Hmong. Interpreters are needed.

Anna spoke about the chart "Measures of Success." 141 were referred to cessation, 52 registered for classes, and 11 actually quit. Out of 977 encounters, 305 smoked, and 431 had smokers in the house. Brandy is doing both the registration and follow-up calls for American Lung. They thought childcare or transportation was a barrier to attending classes, but people say they are simply busy. Anna asked for ongoing funding for the project.

Marian said this and American Lung (which has ended) was the only tobacco cessation project we funded.

Gene asked for relapse numbers. Discussion ensued that only 20-30% who quit maintain, due to the insidious nature of the addiction. People quit at four weeks in the class, and most stay quit at 8 weeks. 44% of smokers have kids being exposed to second-hand smoke. It is mostly the white population who smokes.

Scott Heinze, Parent Education Network, presented for the Exchange Club for the Prevention of Child Abuse (CAPC). The long-term goal was to come up with a Strategic Plan for the sustainability of CAPC, and provide services. CAPC is a group of professionals and volunteers who assist families to develop better parenting skills, strengthen family communication, and access community services. All programs are provided free of charge. Family dynamics can create high-risk environmental factors creating child abuse and neglect. Trainings provided by CAPC are designed to empower the family to reduce factors. The two primary programs are Family Mentors, who train people to be better parents, and Professional Case Management, a family support worker who provides oversight to the Family Mentors, and provides assessment and referral services. Mentors are trained regarding mandated reporting laws, positive parenting modeling, and community resources. CAPC has existed since 1987. Currently they have 38 families, and 81 children. Funding for CAPC comes from several sources, and fundraisers. The BCCFC grant has helped

create a stronger board, a strategic plan to get CAPC out of debt, new potential funding streams, an endowment grant, new special events fundraisers, and an increase in volunteer services with lower risk families.

Marian asked whether the CAPC board was separate from the PEN board. The Executive Director is the same (Dana Campbell), but two different boards govern.

Patricia thanked the presenters.

Item 8: Bio-Break

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m. and reconvened at 11:07 a.m.

Item 9: Financial Planning Work Session with Prop 10 TASC Consultant Barbara Riley. Baseline projections using current funding commitments, discussion and determination of key policy questions to forecast across revenue and expense of Commission's budget. Financial planning will guide the management of investments over a five to ten-year period.

Barbara Riley began by commending the Butte County Commission Staff on being aware of the necessity for, and reporting financial status to Commissioners long before the financial planning trainings were available from TASC.

Barbara passed out PowerPoint handouts, and said we'll be spending a lot of time on the policy questions Cheryl had presented to Commissioners as homework, the objectives and goals of the financial plan. Staff developed a baseline spreadsheet, and Barbara added some scenarios to show what we can do with the spreadsheet. Last we'll talk about the principles of having a plan.

Barbara said the Butte County Commission staff had attended financial planning workshops in June and had prepared the initial documents. Staff is playing a very large role in financial planning. Today we're reviewing and making decisions about the policy questions,

The financial plan supports the Strategic Plan (SP) to have a sound financial basis. The Funding Allocation Plan is another tool, which uses the data from the Financial Plan to allow multi-year funding plans. The Budget appropriates funding for one year.

In Steven Kaplan's workshop, we came up with funding priorities: 1) Comprehensive, prevention oriented health care [proper immunizations, screening, treatment, continuity of services, a medical home (a consistent primary care physician, where education, preventative treatment, and referral services are accessible), and timely access to prenatal care]; 2) Diagnostic assessment (a "Whole Child Assessment," including social, emotional, cognitive, and physical development), 3) Family-based mental health services (services that focus on emotional/ behavioral health of families); 4) Outreach to families (connecting families to education, services, and resources; including children in informal care); 5) Professional development (to build the skills and knowledge of Early Care and Development Providers, and to enhance the professionalism of the field with recognition and pay).

Barbara next presented the partial responses received from Commissioners to the Key Policy Questions. The first question, "What are the funding priorities of the Commission's Strategic Plan," may provide part of the goal for our financial plan. What do we wish to fund? Commissioners answered 1) That Diagnostic Assessment, Comprehensive Health Care, and Professional Development were most important, 2) Building a reserve and stay within budget, 3) Choose more specific funding areas, as SP is very general.

Marian asked if prioritization of funding would be a continuing process. Barbara answered that we are doing the beginning step. When looking at the spreadsheets, we'll see if we have the money to fund all priorities. We may have to prioritize the priorities and fund only the top ones. We are getting input from partners, and will ratify the priorities in our October meeting.

Barbara said the policy questions are background questions. Talking about them gets us ready for the financial process. These questions are starting points for priorities.

Barbara read the second question, "What thinking do Commissioners need to do to address declining revenues and increasing program costs?" Commissioners responded 1) Need awareness of current political process and how investments are proceeding, 2) How long do we want to exist? 3) Need significant TA, 4) Explore grant funding and leveraging, 5) Set up infrastructure, new and renovated facilities, stronger partnerships, better assessment, tracking of outcomes.

Gene asked whether sustainability refers to the Commission or programs funded by the Commission. Mark said maybe less revenues means less people are smoking. Barbara said much of the decline is because purchases are being made on the Internet or in Nevada. Marian said a \$2 or \$3 tax is on the Legislature's mind. There is no Prop 10 backfill. Prop 99 has been around for 12 years, and the schools have found monies available are not enough to be effective, so competitive grants are the trend. This may happen to Prop 10 too.

Barbara said with the new proposed tobacco tax our revenues may be severely reduced. A new tobacco tax is a horrible way to solve a deficient problem, because it penalizes the poor, who are most addicted to tobacco.

Marian voiced concern over falling interest and investments rates. Barbara said our interest rate is higher than many large counties (all of our monies are receiving a reserve interest rate 4.72%).

Barbara moved to question 3: "What strategies have we already employed to address this decline?" Commissioners responded 1) Examine return on investment, 2) Strategic Plan Funding Allocation Prioritization, 3) Reserve fund established, and 4) Lots of discussion, a Fiscal Subcommittee, fiscal training for all commissioners, and setting up a trust fund with discussions with Auditor. Mark added we have supported grants using leveraging, so our funds have gone further. Some was leveraged from State Commission monies too.

Barbara asked whether MAA or Title 19 monies were coming in. Cheryl answered yes; Commission staff salaries are included in Public Health MAA applications.

Barbara went on to question 4, "What should be sustained." Commissioners responded, 1) Increased pay and professional development for ECE providers, 2) School Readiness, 3) Service coordination and collaboration, 4) Our successful programs, 5) Large and small grants each year, 5) Mini-grants accountability and reporting, 6) Data needed for future needs.

Marian said we haven't yet done anything about evaluation yet. Barbara said the baseline spreadsheet has 3.5% allocated to evaluation yearly.

The next question was read, "What is the community capacity to develop qualified Prop 10 eligible programs today?" Partial responses from Commissioners were 1) Community has the capacity, 2) collaboration is taking place among providers, 3) Programs need to achieve fiscal sustainability, 4) More assessment and outreach to families, 5) Lack facilities, and professional development. [Staff note: There is high staff turnover in grantee organizations. Is this an indication there is actually little community capacity? Many of our grants are slow in meeting benchmarks because of turnover.]

Marian said she feels there is capacity to develop grants, but no capacity to sustain them. When our funding ends, the programs will likely end. The Commission has had sustainability because we are not providing endless funding.

"What are the trade-offs between funding at full capacity versus dedicating funds for the future?" Commissioners answered 1) Amounts available to programs should decrease over time, 2) Will there be enough money to refund successful projects? 3) Save money now for the future, 4) Take time to build partnerships, sound ideas, plans.

"What are the financial goals and objectives of the Commission?" Partial responses from Commissioners: 1) Be realistic about declining funding, 2) Identify funding partners, 3) Build a prudent reserve, 4) Limit administrative expenses, 5) Leverage funds, 6) Sound stewardship, 7) Plan for sustainability, or growth (i.e. with other Counties, etc.). Mark said he'd like to go after other dollars, i.e., foundations, etc.

Marian said funding is available, but must be matched dollar for dollar. Barbara said that foundations have lost a lot in the stock market so there's much less money available, but this avenue should be checked.

Barbara passed out the baseline spreadsheet staff developed, and said all numbers are changeable. The baseline shows only those commitments made and budgeted. A 6% decline was used. It's hard to know what the level of decline will be. 6% is not too low for the beginning step of what we're doing. Inflation was assumed at 2.5%. Interest is at 4.72%, as reported by the Treasurer. The full cost of Commission staff and operating expenses (rent, supplies, etc.) are listed under Admin. costs, but can be divided out into Program and Admin. costs. Program costs can be billed out to MAA, and reimbursed for 50%. Title 19 is the Federal component to MAA (MediCal Admin. Activity) and TCM (the Medicaid Act, MediCal). TCM (Targeted Case Management) documentation requirements are a bit more cumbersome. These can also be used by the grantees to draw down more funds. The TASC center is about to publish an updated leveraging primer. It should be available the end of September.

Marian asked that Program and Admin. costs be divided out, and to add step and increased healthcare costs to the projections.

Barbara passed out a second spreadsheet showing what would happen if we committed 1.5 million per year for grants. We'd still have almost a million left in the bank after 10 years of operation.

A financial plan is a tool to be updated annually to reflect actual expenditures and to adjust economic assumptions to current forecasts. The financial plan will show what happens to the bottom line, as different scenarios are considered. The only worrisome thing is the impact of the State budget. The Financial Plan should be high-level general allocations. The spreadsheet is changeable to reflect Commissioners desires and decisions. The quality forecasting is in the first five years, because it's difficult to accurately forecast beyond that.

There was discussion regarding the potential of having less staff in the future, and adding 5% increases in the spreadsheet.

The meeting broke for lunch at 12:10 p.m.

Item 10: Lunch, Closure on Work Session, and General Announcements

After eating, setting up a Reserve fund was discussed. Our large cash balance is not a reserve. Usually funds are set-aside in a separate account. Sometimes the reserve is paid a higher rate of interest (our fund is receiving the higher reserve rate, as per the Treasurer's office). We can just have a line item for our reserve account, and can pinpoint use of these monies, for example, to exist beyond 10 years if desired.

As for leveraged funds, we should wait until we have a few years history on a revenue before it is included and counted on in our Financial Plan.

Marian asked that a new spreadsheet be constructed showing a 10% decline in revenues, increasing staff costs 5 to 6%, allocating money yearly into a reserve, coming up with a zero balance after ten years, with 1.5 million in grants distributed by the preliminary funding allocations from the June meeting. Priority setting and funding, is of course dependent on evaluation and documented outcomes.

Having a subcommittee of Commissioners and staff come up with various scenarios and balance the SP to the Financial Plan was discussed. The SP Committee will work on the prioritization process, and the Admin. Committee will work on the Financial Plan

Marian asked that the May meeting charts be looked at again. What items were collapsed into what?

Marian requested mini-grant presentations be stopped until the Financial Plan is in place.

Laurie Aumack announced focus groups would be held nightly, rotating between cities, Sept. 24 to Sept 27, 2002, for the KISP (Kids Improved Safety Program) Home Health Care Management grant.

The meeting adjourned at 1:28 p.m.

Minutes by Eva Puciata.